

# Comparing Psychological Capital among Teachers in a Rural and Urban Area: A Case in Tegrai Regional State

**Samuel Embiza Tadesse**

Ph.D. Scholar  
Academic staff in  
Department of Psychology,  
Adigrat University, Ethiopia,  
Ph.D. Scholar  
Punjabi University, Punjab, India.

**Vidhu Mohan**

Assistant Professor,  
Deptt. of Psychology,  
Punjabi University,  
Patiala, Punjab, India

## Abstract

The purpose of the present study was to compare the level of PsyCap among teachers from Urban & Rural areas in the Tegrai Regional State. Beside this, the study also aimed at exploring differences in PsyCap on the basis of some demographic variables (gender, years of experience, age, and marital status). Through the multi-stage cluster sampling technique, a systematic sampling method was used to select schools of both elementary and high school levels to give equal chance of being chosen. Hence, 800 respondents; were selected for the questionnaire. It was found that urban teachers as compared to their rural counterparts scored significantly higher on efficacy, hope, resilience, and optimism dimensions of PsyCap. For other demographic variables, namely gender, years of experience, and age, there was a significant difference among urban teachers than teachers in rural areas. The findings have been explained on the basis of previous researches, and hence, the implications of the findings have been discussed besides, conclusion and suggestion have been given.

**Keywords:** Teachers' PsyCap, Rural, Urban, Woreda.

## Introduction

Socrates, the father of philosophy postulates that teaching as an instrument for modelling the future of every citizen (Mhire, 2006). Similarly, in the Ethiopian case for example, an Ethiopian fundamental economist Gebrehiwet Baykedagn (1886-1919) said education is an essential component of overall development a country (Alemayehu, 2013). Thus, education is among the front pillar in building a nation as it is an engine to every other sector where teachers are found to be the backbone of education (Strauss, 2017). Therefore, it can be said that teaching is supposed to be a respected profession for it is the source of every other profession since old times. As a matter of fact, while living alive, either we are teaching or else learning from. Hence, being a teacher has a dual purpose: on one hand it makes you lifelong learner on the other hand it enables you to teach and influence others in many ways (Davis & Andrzejewski, 2009)

However, teaching as a profession suffer from high turnover due to low salary disrespect by administration and society, and students conduct (Gonzalez, Brown, & Slate, 2008) and workload, the school situation, salary and personal circumstances (Smithers & Robinson, 2003). Besides, these factors, location of school, i.e. urban /rural areas has also been found to be related to job satisfaction Demato (2002). For instance, Newby (1999) found that rural principals appeared to be least satisfied. Thus, because Urban & Rural areas have different types of facilities to offer, it can contribute significantly in various job-related outcomes like job-satisfaction, work motivation, job-performance, etc. Keeping the importance of location/area in mind, the present study was designed to see whether teachers from Urban and Rural areas differ significantly on psychological capital. PsyCap is the core factor to build positive organizational behavior.

PsyCap can be defined as examining the process by which positive attitude and feedback, contribute to the advancement of an individual (Cavus & Gokcen, 2015). Therefore, according to Peterson, Luthans, Avolio, Walumbwa, and Zhang (2011), PsyCap is a fundamental capacity, which is critical for human motivation, cognitive functioning, striving for success, and performance at work.

According to Luthans, Luthans, & Luthans, (2004) PsyCap consists of the positive psychological states such as self-confidence/self-

efficacy, hope, optimism and resiliency which have direct and positive relationship with various work-related outcomes. For instance, Wang, Chen, & Hsu, (2014) found that teachers have high self-efficacy for they know themselves how to teach, however, teachers have lowest resilience due to workloads and teachers' rights seem to be derived from time to time.

### Statement of the Problem

Despite the fact that PsyCap is essential in any organizational system, little academic studies have been done to date on teachers or not yet been done in comparing of rural and urban area. Nonetheless, such psychological variable is important at least in any country's educational system for teachers are expected to meet the standard quality and fulfill the expectation of the society to accelerate the development in all direction.

Furthermore, past studies that attempt to connect concept of different dimensions of PysCap have been inadequate. For instance, Yalcin, (2016) found that there is a significant positive relationship between teachers' PsyCap and organizational commitment. Similarly, Wang et al., (2014) found that PsyCap has a positive significant correlation with teaching philosophy, teaching strategy, teaching assessment and class leadership which together constitute the notion teaching effectiveness.

As can be inferred from the above paragraphs, although teachers' PsyCap (Yalcin, 2016; Jaggwe, 2014) is among the most predictive variables to teachers related variables within the school, little is known if school location could differ.

In this study, Tigray regional state in Ethiopia becomes a focal point for two reasons. First, the educational quality in the region is deteriorating from time to time where teachers are being blamed for. Second, teaching profession these days are accompanied by high turnover rate than other sectors due to economical and psychological factors.

Besides, it is notable that stockholders in education sector of the country are being busy in giving emphasis to the hard ware than psychological status of the teachers. For instance, Bhuin (2017) stated that teaching is consistently among the top three most stressful professions based on a well-being study in 80 occupations. This indicates the pressures put on teachers, heavy workload and lack of government attention. Wonderfully, even with all these problems, teachers are being devoted and dedicated their lives to students. Based on the aforementioned premises some research objectives and hypothesis were prepared.

### Objectives of the Study

1. To examine the level of teachers' PsyCap.
2. To analyze if there is a significant difference between teachers' PsyCap in urban and rural area.
3. To explore if there is a significant difference between some selected demographic variables (gender, experience, age and marital status) on teachers PsyCap in urban and rural area.

### Research Hypothesis

The following hypotheses were formulated.

1. The level of PsyCap among urban teachers would be higher than that of rural teachers
2. There will be significant differences between teachers' PsyCap on the bases of some selected demographic variables.
  - a) PsyCap would be higher among female teachers than male teachers
  - b) PsyCap would be higher among greater experience than those with less experience
  - c) PsyCap among old teachers would be higher than the young teachers
  - d) PsyCap of married teachers would be higher than those who are single

### Significance of Study

Understanding teachers' positive psychological status has numerous advantages to enable teachers more professionals and to stand for the profession and obligate for their passion (Williams, Ritter, & Bullock, 2012). Human nature depends on attitude. PsyCap contributes a lot to teachers work motivation and professionalism in order to have a core of life skill, communication, which in turn help a teacher to collaborate with others and work effectively as a team toward common goals (Kramer, 2003). Thus, it can be inferred that studying teachers' PsyCap enable the educator to be able to prepare better for classroom management and create an effective learning environment (Oliver, and Reschly, 2007).

Moreover, finding of this study would have a great significance to understand the question of quality education where a number of stockholders worrying about. Therefore, if intervention is needed, the document report of this study would help a lot as baseline study for teachers' positive psychology interventions. The study might further make a myriad of contributions to the literature on teachers' PsyCap which is going to be part of articles useful by researchers who want to further study and to other stakeholders in the areas of educational and organizational behavior aspect.

### Review of related literature

#### Teachers' PsyCap

The concept PsyCap emerged as one of the main contributions to the current research works of industrial or organizational psychology. Hence, as stated in Luthans, Avolio, Avey, & Norman (2007) PsyCap is defined as an individual's positive psychological state of development that is characterized by (a) having confidence (*self-efficacy*); (b) having positive expectations (*optimism*); (c) persevering toward goals (*hope*); and (d) sustaining and bouncing back (*resilience*) to attain success.

#### Efficacy

Efficacy is defined as an individual's self-belief about her/his own ability to mobilize own motivation, cognitive resources, and courses of action required to execute any specific task successfully within a given context (Stajkovic & Luthans, 1998). For instance, in a meta-analysis of 114 empirical studies, Stajkovic and Luthans (1998) examined the relationship between self-efficacy and work-related performance, indicated a significant and positive

relationship between self-efficacy and work-related performance.

**Hope**

It is commonly used in everyday language and is misunderstood with wishful thinking (Lopez, 2014). But, the dimension ‘hope’ of PsyCap is different and is defined as a “positive motivational state” (Snyder, 2002). Peterson and Byron (2008) found that service workers, telecommunication executives, and mortgage brokers who were high on hope display higher level of work performance. One can capitalize hope through the nurturing of its components: goals, agency, and pathways (Ouweneel, Le Blanc, Schaufeli & van Wijhe, 2012).

**Optimism**

In simple term, an optimist is a person who expects positive and good things to happen to them, whereas a pessimist is always occupied with negative thoughts and believe that undesirable things will happen to them (Carver & Scheier, 2002). Thus, optimism continues to keep an individual positive and confident about the future events.

With the advent of positive organizational behavior, studies on the association between optimism and work performance have been initiated in the field of organizational behavior, such as Seligman and Schulman (1986) found insurance agent’s optimism has a positive relationship with their higher level of performance. Similarly, in the Chinese context factory worker’s optimism has been seen having a positive impact on their work performance (Luthans, Avolio, Walumbwa, & Li, 2005).

**Resilience**

In an organizational context, resilience is characterized by a transparent view of reality (Coutu, 2002). It has been defined as “positive psychological capacity to rebound, to ‘bounce back’ from adversity, uncertainty, conflict, failure, or even positive change, progress and increased responsibility” (Luthans, 2002).

At the workplace, employees who are resilient are able to deal with the workplace demands in a better way, especially when demands require them to deal with constantly changing priorities. For instance, Luthans et al., (2005) found a positive relationship between the resilience level of Chinese factory workers and their work-related performance.

Thus, all the four dimensions of PsyCap are relatively new to the field of positive organizational

behavior, are state-like and developable in nature, have valid measures, and have positive relationship with work-related outcomes and performance (Luthans et al., 2005; Peterson & Byron, 2008; Seligman & Schulman, 1986; Stajkovic & Luthans, 1998; Youssef & Luthans, 2007). Despite the fact that extensive researches in PsyCap, few literatures are available linking teachers related research.

**3. Method**

**Sample**

The sample for the present study comprised 800 teachers working in rural and urban areas of Tegrai regional state, Ethiopia. The age range of the participants was 20-59. Prior consent of the participants and their respective school principals was sought.

**Design**

Cross sectional design has been used where a quantitative method was employed to collect and analyze data. A multi-stage sampling technique was employed as a strategy to reach on the final study participants. An independent t test and one way ANOVA have been used to examine the dependent and independent variables of the study. Apart from that, reporting an effect size becomes a common in psychological and other social science research results (Baguley, 2009; Levine & Hullelt, 2002) just to make the result clearer to reader. Hence, Cohen d was used to measure the effect size in t test, as well as eta squared ( $\eta^2$ ) was considered while reporting results of ANOVA (Levine & Hullelt, 2002).

**Tool**

PsyCap Questionnaire (Luthans et al., 2007) found in the research work of Jaggwe (2014) was adopted for it was related to teachers’ related research. It measured on a 6 point Likert-type scale, accordingly, the overall reliability of the instrument was calculated 0.72 of Cronbach alpha. In the pilot study, the reliability of the instrument was found to be 0.93 of Cronbach alpha, besides, the face validity was checked by measurement and evaluation expertise in Adigrat University.

**Result**

**Demographic Variables**

The response rate was 89.6 percent. Gender wise it was (F=162 (46.6 percent) and M= 186 (53.4 percent)) in rural and (F=162 (43.9 percent) and M= 207 (56.1 percent)) in urban area. The following table 1 shows the overall demographic variables:

**Table 1: Demographic Variable of the Study**

Variable	SchoolLocation	Category	Frequency	Percent
<b>Gender</b>	Rural	Male	186	53.4
		Female	162	46.6
		Total	348	100.0
	Urban	Male	207	56.1
		Female	162	43.9
		Total	369	100.0
<b>Yearsof Experience</b>	Rural	1-10	170	48.9
		11-20	158	45.4
		21-30	18	5.2
		31-40	2	.6
		Total	348	100.0
	Urban	1-10	64	17.3

		11-20	131	35.5
		21-30	123	33.3
		31-40	51	13.8
		Total	369	100.0
<b>Age</b>	Rural	20-29	96	27.6
		30-39	217	62.4
		40-49	28	8.0
		50-60	7	2.0
	Total	348	100.0	
	Urban	20-29	30	8.1
		30-39	128	34.7
40-49		137	37.1	
50-60		74	20.1	
Total	369	100.0		
<b>MaritalStatus</b>	Rural	Single	93	26.7
		Married	233	67.0
		Divorced	22	6.3
		Total	348	100.0
	Urban	Single	65	17.6
		Married	271	73.4
		Divorced	33	8.9
Total		369	100.0	

Furthermore, the proposed hypothesis was tested by independent t-test and ANOVA based on the research questions.

To explore the level of teachers PsyCap, average teachers perceived of composite PsyCap reported by urban group (n=362) to the average teachers perceived of composite PsyCap reported by rural group (n=298) was compared.

The Levene's test for equality of variance was significant (F= 9.029, Sig< .05). The assumption of homogeneity of variance has been violated. Thus, as

shown in Table 1 below, equal variance not assumed was considered while reporting t test except in the case of "hope". Therefore, the t test was statistically significant, with the "Urban" group (M=4.50, SD= .81) reporting some .21 mean difference positive/higher level of PsyCap, 95% CI [.08, .34] than the "Rural" group (M=4.28, SD= .91), t(717)=3.29, p= 0.001, two-tailed, d= 0.26. The Cohen's d, as Cohen (1988 in Becker, 2000) suggested, it has a small effect size which indicates the two groups differ by 0.26 standard deviation.

**Table 2: independent t-test results comparing urban and rural Teachers' PsyCap levels**

Sub-Dimensions	School Location	N	M	SD	df	t	p
Efficacy	Urban	369	4.71	.913	690.4	2.45	.015
	Rural	348	4.53	1.04			
Hope	Urban	369	4.54	.956	715	3.24	.001
	Rural	348	4.29	1.07			
Resilience	Urban	369	4.37	.809	683.3	2.87	.004
	Rural	348	4.18	.949			
Optimism	Urban	369	4.36	.887	688.4	3.23	.001
	Rural	348	4.13	1.02			
Composite	Urban	369	4.50	.805	692.2	3.29	.001
	Rural	348	4.28	.911			

\* p< 0.001, \*\*p<0.05

**H<sub>01</sub>) The level of PsyCap among urban teachers would be higher than that of rural teachers**

As indicated in the above Table 1, the t test was statistically significant at α .05 in the comparison of PsyCap dimensions, "Urban" group had more higher PsyCap than in the "Rural" group; " efficacy" [t(717)=2.45, p= 0.015, two-tailed, d= 0.18], "Hope" [t(717)=3.24, p= 0.001, two-tailed, d= 0.25], "Resilience" [t(717)=2.87, p= 0.004, two-tailed, d= 0.22], and "optimism" [t(717)=3.23, p= 0.001, two-tailed, d= 0.24]. The Cohen's d, is small effect size except for the efficacy it is trivial which indicates the result is not statistically significant.

**H<sub>02</sub>) There will be significant differences between teachers' PsyCap on the bases of some selected demographic variables.**

**H<sub>02a</sub>) PsyCap female teachers would be higher than male teachers**

An independent t test was used to compare the average teachers PsyCap reported by urban and rural working area based on their gender. Neither Shapiro-wilk statistics was significant, indicating that the assumption of normality was not violated. The Levene's test for equality of variance is not significant (F= .113, Sig> .05) for rural group and, (F= .539, Sig> .05) for urban teachers group. The assumption of homogeneity of variance has not been violated. Thus, as shown in Table 2 below, equal variance assumed was considered while reporting t test. Therefore, the t test was not statistically significant for the rural group,

whereas in the urban teachers the "female" group (M=4.65, SD=.76) reporting some .27 mean difference higher PsyCap, 95% CI [.10, .43] than the "male"

group (M=4.38, SD=.82),  $t(717) = 3.22, p = 0.001$ , two-tailed,  $d = 0.34$ . The Cohen's  $d$ , is small effect size.

**Table 3: independent t-test results, based on gender, comparing urban and rural Teachers' PsyCap levels**

School Location	Variable	level	N	M	SD	df	t	p
Rural	Gender	Female	162	4.36	.889	346	1.37	.171
		Male	186	4.22	.929			
Urban	Gender	Female	162	4.65	.763	367	3.22	.001
		Male	207	4.38	.820			

\*  $p < 0.001$ , \*\* $p < 0.05$

**H<sub>0</sub>2b) PsyCap among greater experience would be higher than those with less experience**

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to compare the urban and rural teacher groups to measure the level of their PsyCap based on work experience, and to identify which group of teachers significantly different. The inspection of skewness, kurtosis and Shapiro-Wilk statistics indicated that the assumption of normality was supported for each of the four conditions in both rural and urban location.

Hence, the ANOVA was not statistically significant for the teachers who work in rural districts,  $F(3, 344) = .75, p = .522$ . where as in the urban district, as Table 3, indicating that the teachers PsyCap is

differ based on the work experience they had,  $F(3, 365) = 6.026, p = .001, \eta^2 = .047$  that is 4.7 % of variability of teachers PsyCap is contributed by work experience.

The post hoc analysis with Tukey's HSD (using an  $\alpha$  of .05) indicated that there is a difference between the mean of teachers PsyCap with experience years 31-40 years and 1-10 years as well with 11-20 years,  $p = 0.015$  and  $p = .000$  respectively. Hence, as can be referred from Table 3 below, teachers in a 31-40 years of experience group (M=4.85, SD=.85) had significantly higher PsyCap than teachers in a 1-10 years (M=4.40, SD=.75) and teachers in an 11-20 years (M=4.33, SD=.79) groups.

**Table 4 ANOVA result Comparisons of teachers' PsyCap in Urban and Rural according to Year of Experience**

Location	Years	N	M	SD	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Rural	1-10	170	4.25	.99	1.88	3	.625	.751	.522
	11-20	158	4.28	.85	286.37	344	.832		
	21-30	18	4.59	.66	288.2	347			
	31-40	2	4.35	.85					
	Total	348	4.28	.91					
Urban	1-10	64	4.40	.76	11.26	3	3.753	6.026	.001
	11-20	131	4.33	.79	227.31	365	.623		
	21-30	123	4.57	.78	238.57	368			
	31-40	51	4.85	.85					
	Total	369	4.50	.80					

\*  $p < 0.001$ , \*\* $p < 0.05$

**H<sub>0</sub>2c) PsyCap among old teachers would be higher than the young teachers**

Similar to the above hypothesis test, a one-way ANOVA was conducted to compare the urban and rural teacher groups to measure the level of their PsyCap based on age, and to identify which group of teachers significantly different. The inspection of skewness, kurtosis and Shapiro-Wilk statistics indicated that the assumption of normality was supported for each of the four conditions in both rural and urban location.

Hence, the ANOVA was not statistically significant for the teachers who work in rural districts,

$F(3, 344) = 1.245, p = .293$ . where as in the urban district, as Table 4, indicating that the teachers PsyCap is differ based on their age,  $F(3, 365) = 2.679, p = .047, \eta^2 = .022$  that is 2.2 % of variability of teachers PsyCap is contributed by age.

The post hoc analysis with Tukey's HSD (using an  $\alpha$  of .05) indicated that there is a difference between the mean of teachers PsyCap with age group of 50-60 and 30-39,  $p = 0.031$ . Hence, as can be referred from Table 4 below, teachers in age group of 50-60 (M=4.71, SD=.85) had significantly higher PsyCap than teachers in a 30-39 years of age group (M=4.38, SD=.71). TheCohen  $d$  is found to be 0.42.

**Table 5. ANOVA result, Comparisons of teachers' PsyCap in Urban and Rural according to their age**

Location	Age	N	M	SD	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Rural	20-29	96	4.27	.97	3.10	3	1.032	1.245	.293
	30-39	217	4.26	.91	285.15	344	.829		
	40-49	28	4.60	.71	288.24	347			
	50-60	7	4.11	.52					
	Total	348	4.28	.91					
Urban	20-29	30	4.40	.75	5.14	3	1.713	2.679	.047
	30-39	128	4.39	.71	233.43	365	.640		
	40-49	137	4.50	.86	238.57	368			
	50-60	74	4.71	.85					
	Total	369	4.50	.81					

\*  $p < 0.001$ , \*\* $p < 0.05$

**H<sub>2d</sub>) PsyCap of married teachers would be higher than those who are single**

Likewise, a one-way ANOVA was also conducted to compare the urban and rural teacher groups to measure the level of their PsyCap based on marital status, and to identify which group of teachers significantly different. The inspection of skewness, kurtosis and Shapiro-Wilk statistics indicated that the assumption of normality was supported for each of the four conditions in both rural and urban location.

Thus, the ANOVA was not statistically significant for the teachers who work in urban districts,  $F(2, 366) = 1.820, p = .163$ . where as in the rural

district, as Table 5, indicating that the teachers PsyCap is differ based on their age,  $F(2, 345) = 3.229, p = .041, \eta^2 = .018$  that is 1.8 % of variability of teachers PsyCap is contributed by marital status.

The post hoc analysis with Tukey's HSD (using an  $\alpha$  of .05) indicated that there is a difference between the mean of teachers PsyCap to single and married teachers,  $p = 0.05$ . Hence, as can be referred from Table 5 below, married teachers ( $M = 4.34, SD = .87$ ) had significantly higher PsyCap than single teachers ( $M = 4.09, SD = .98$ ). The Cohen  $d$  effect size actually is 0.27.

**Table 6. ANOVA result, Comparisons of teachers' PsyCap in Urban and Rural according to marital status**

School Location	Marital Status	N	M	SD	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Rural	Single	93	4.09	.99	5.30	2	2.648	3.229	.041
	Married	233	4.34	.88	282.95	345	.820		
	Divorced	22	4.48	.84	288.24	347			
	Total	348	4.28	.91					
Urban	Single	65	4.34	.83	2.35	2	1.175	1.820	.163
	Married	271	4.54	.81	236.22	366	.645		
	Divorced	33	4.41	.65	238.57	368			
	Total	369	4.50	.80					

\*  $p < 0.001$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$

**Discussion**

This research was carried out with the purpose of comparing teachers' PsyCap in urban and rural school location. The result revealed teachers PsyCap in urban is significantly higher ( $M = 4.50$ ) than their rural counterpart ( $M = 4.28$ ). The finding is similar to a study done in Trinidadian teachers although it is studied on teachers in urbanized area (Bissessar, 2014). Thus, it can be said that the positive psychological state of teachers in urban area is better than those who work in rural area. Because the overall PsyCap is characterized by its sub dimensions, the second hypothesis test was also established in a similar manner.

The finding of the sub dimension to teachers PsyCap also show similar result that is the urban group show higher perception on self-efficacy, hope, optimism and resilience than the teachers who work in rural areas. The average score for "self- efficacy" was the highest ( $M = 4.71$  and  $SD = .91$ ), followed by "hope" ( $M = 4.54$  and  $SD = 1.04$ ) and "resilience" ( $M = 4.37$  and  $SD = .81$ ), and the average score for "optimism" was the lowest ( $M = 4.36$  and  $SD = .89$ ). The finding is in line with (Wang, Chen, & Hsu, 2014) where the highest score was self-efficacy; however, it is contrary in the lowest score where resiliency was the lowest in the study of (Wang, et al., 2014).

Moreover, the urban teachers' scores for the four dimensions of PsyCap were all close to five, higher than the median value which indicates that the PsyCap of these teachers was quite good. According to the effect size result of Cohen's  $d$  actually, the difference is small. Apart from that the difference in self-efficacy is trivial, which can be said that it is not statistically sound to conclude there is a difference between the two groups. On the other hand, although it is small size effect, the other three factors of PsyCap are found to be different in these two groups where teachers in rural area have lesser hope,

resilience, and optimism. Such a psychological state could be a reason to teachers' burnout, leads teachers to illegal migration or change profession even to lesser salary than they had.

The third hypothesis was intended to perform if there is a significant difference of teachers PsyCap based on some selected demographic variables. Hence, it was classified further into sub hypothesis in order to manage the independent variables. The first was comparing gender wise in both urban and rural group. Hence, there was no statistically significant difference between genders in the rural area difference as has been found by Rodrigues, Carochinho, & Rendeiro, (2017) in Portugal. However, in the urban area, female teachers have higher PsyCap than their counter part male teachers. Similar result was found in Indian context (Singh & Garg, 2014). However, the present research result is to the contrary to the finding of Parthi & Gupta, (2016) a study done in the telecom sector. Besides, it is also to the contrary of the finding of Rodrigues, et al., (2017) in Portugal when referred the results of teachers PsyCap in urban area. The present result could be an indicator of the mental satisfaction of female teacher for the reason they got comparatively better facilities than the rural one. In line with this, male teachers in urban area might search other job opportunities whereas female teachers are loyal to the profession.

Regarding work experience comparison, still there is no basic difference on teachers' PsyCap of rural teachers. However Table 3 shows that there is statistically significant difference between those who have more than 31 years of experience and lower than 20 years of teaching experience. The result is in tune with the finding of (Wang, et al., 2014). Hence, the more the teacher stays in the profession the better the positivity due to higher resilience to difficulty, becoming optimist and having will power that is hope. Thus, it can be inference from the eta squared value

that 4.7 percent of the variability of teachers' PsyCap can be contributed by work experience.

In line with the years of experience, teachers in rural area cannot be differ due to their age which seems in line with Rodrigues, et al., (2017) whereas teachers PsyCap of the urban area show statistically significant different between age of more than 50 and 30-39 years of age. This result from the urban area is to the contrary of the finding of Rodrigues, et al., (2017) in Portugal where it has found that there is no statistically significant difference among the teachers PsyCap age wise. This indicated that, in the first ten years of working teachers would show some positive attitude to their work, when they think they are secured and searching alternative job they start to loss their PsyCap. Obviously, as they become old age then the stability accompanied by positive psychological status would help to retain in their profession. The calculated result of eta square showed that 2.2 percent of variability of teachers PsyCap can be explained by teachers' age.

Likewise, in order to understand teachers PsyCap based on the marital status, as indicated in Table 5 ANOVA was performed. The result showed that there is no statically significant difference among teachers marital status in urban areas which is in line with the finding of Rodrigues, et al., (2017) in Portugal where it has found that there is no statistically significant difference among the teachers PsyCap marital status wise. However, it seems contrary to the finding of the present study if taken a look at the rural groups, married teachers have more PsyCap than unmarried or single teachers. Thus, the finding from the rural area goes in line with what (Wang, et al., 2014) found. Besides, the eta square found from Table 5 revealed that 1.8 percent of the variability of rural teachers PsyCap is contributed by marital status.

### Conclusion

From the result and discussion of the present research it can be concluded that, teacher's PsyCap in urban is more than the teachers who are in rural. This could be due to economic factors, and less facilities. Dimension wise, however, there is no statistical difference based on the teachers self-efficacy. Meaning, teachers do share similar confidence while involving in their teaching profession. Nevertheless, teachers hope, optimism and resilience is found to be good status in urban teachers. Besides, there is no teachers PsyCap difference based on gender in rural area, whereas, when examined the urban area teachers female have more PsyCap than male teachers. On one hand, teachers' years of experience has no influence on rural area teachers while it has effect on the urban teachers which can be conclude that as years of experience increases teachers PsyCap also increase that is the variability of teachers PsyCap can explained by work experience. On the other hand, age of teachers has no any effect on those who work in rural area, whereas in the urban areas teachers have different PsyCap based on their age which can be said that the older the teacher the more PsyCap it would be. Furthermore, marital status can influence teachers PsyCap in rural areas than the urban

teachers. All in all, teachers in rural areas show lower PsyCap. Therefore, concerned bodies should work on psychological patterns of teachers by providing motivational training, fulfilling facilities such as energy, potable water, health center and housing service. Above all a positive psychology as a project should be given to teachers in the study area. This would help in keeping the psychological satisfaction of teachers which could possibly influence the work motivation, attitudes to teaching effectiveness, stand for their profession, and brining the quality education. Knowledge and skill without attitude are like unfulfilled entity.

### References

- Akob, M. (2016). *Influence Workload, Work Ethic and Job Satisfaction toward Teacher's Performance (Study of Islamic-based School in Makasar- Indonesia)*. *Global Advanced Research Journal of Management and Business Studies* Vol. 5(7) 172-177
- Alemayehu, G., (2013). *Fundamental Economics Thinking of Negaders Gebre-Hiwot Baykedang [in Amharic] Conference Paper (PDF Available), Conference on Gebre-Hiwot Thinkings Organized by Addis Ababa University* Press. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/264004698>
- Baguley, T. (2009). *Standardized or simple effect size: What should be reported?*. *British journal of psychology*, 100(3), 603-617.
- Becker, L. A. (2000). *Effect size (ES)*. <https://www.uv.es/~friasnav/EffectSizeBecker.pdf> Retrieved December, 24, 2018.
- Bhuin, P. K. (2017). *Work-related stress and its global concern: A report with special reference to Teachers' stress in India*. *IMS Business School Presents Doctoral Colloquium – 2017* ISBN: 978-93-85895-57-9. Available at <http://www.managejournal.com/up/conference/20170210153932.pdf>
- Bissessar, C. S. (2014). *An exploration of the relationship between teachers' psychological capital and their collective self-esteem*. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 39(9), 3.
- Carver CS, Scheier MS. (2002). *Optimism*. In Snyder CR, Lopez SJ (Eds.), *Handbook of Positive Psychology* (pp. 231–243). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press. Retrieved from <https://www.pdfdrive.com/handbook-of-positive-psychology-d55246222.html>
- Çavuş, M. F., & Gökçen, A. (2015). *Psychological capital: Definition, components and effects*. *British Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science*, 5(3), 244-255.
- Coutu, D. L. (2002). *How resilience works*. *Harvard Business Review*, 80(5), 46-56.
- Davis, H., & Andrzejewski, C. (2009). *Teacher beliefs*. *Psychology of classroom learning: An encyclopedia (PCL)*, 2, 909-915.
- DeMato, D. S. (2002). *Job satisfaction among elementary school counselors in Virginia:*

- Thirteen years later (Doctoral dissertation, Virginia Tech).
- Fatima, F. and Ali, S. (2016) *The Impact of Teachers' Financial Compensation on their Job Satisfaction at Higher Secondary Level*. *Journal of Socialomics* 5(3) 1-11: doi:10.4172/2167-0358.1000164
- Gonzalez, L. E., Brown, M. S., & Slate, J. R. (2008). *Teachers Who Left the Teaching Profession: A Qualitative Understanding*. *Qualitative Report*, 13(1), 1-11.
- Jaggwe, J. M. (2014). *Teacher Competence, Psychological Capital, Organizational Citizenship Behavior, Work-Life Balance and Teacher Engagement* (Doctoral Dissertation, Makerere University).
- Kramer, P. A. (2003). *The ABC's of professionalism*. *Kappa Delta Pi Record*, 40(1), 22-25.
- Levine, T. R., & Hullett, C. R. (2002). *Eta squared, partial eta squared, and misreporting of effect size in communication research*. *Human Communication Research*, 28(4), 612-625.
- Lopez, S. J. (2014). *Making hope happen: Creating the future you want for yourself and others*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.
- Luthans, F. (2002). *The need for and meaning of positive organizational behavior*. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23(6), 695-706.
- Luthans, F., Avolio, B. J., Walumbwa, F. O., & Li, W. (2005). *The psychological capital of Chinese workers: Exploring the relationship with performance*. *Management and Organization Review*, 1(2), 249-271.
- Luthans, F., Avolio, B. J., Avey, J. B., & Norman, S. M. (2007). *Positive psychological capital: Measurement and relationship with performance and satisfaction*. *Personnel Psychology*, 60, 541-72. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2007.00083.x>
- Luthans, F., Luthans, K. W., & Luthans, B. C. (2004). *Positive psychological capital: Beyond human and social capital*.
- Mhire, J. J. (2006). *"Socrates as citizen?: the implications of Socratic eros for contemporary models of citizenship"*. *LSU Doctoral Dissertations*. 348. [https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool\\_dissertations/348](https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool_dissertations/348)
- Moore, C. M. (2012). *The role of school environment in teacher dissatisfaction among US public school teachers*. *Sage Open*, 2(1) 1-16. DOI: 10.1177/2158244012438888
- Newby, J. E. (1999). *Job satisfaction of middle school principals in Virginia* (Doctoral dissertation, Virginia Tech).
- Oliver, R. M., & Reschly, D. J. (2007). *Effective Classroom Management: Teacher Preparation and Professional Development*. *TQ Connection Issue Paper*. National comprehensive center for teacher quality.
- Ouweneel, E., Le Blanc, P. M., Schaufeli, W. B., & van Wijhe, C. I. (2012). *Good morning, good day: A diary study on positive emotions, hope, and work engagement*. *Human Relations*, 65(9), 1129-1154.
- Parthi, K., & Gupta, R. (2016). *A Study of Psychological Capital, Job Satisfaction and Organizational Climate in Telecom Sector: A Gender Perspective*.
- Peterson, S. J., & Byron, K. (2008). *Exploring the role of hope in job performance: Results from four studies*. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 29(6), 785-803.
- Peterson, S. J., Luthans, F., Avolio, B. J., Walumbwa, F. O., & Zhang, Z. (2011). *Psychological capital and employee performance: A latent growth modeling approach*. *Personnel Psychology*, 64(2), 427-450.
- Rodrigues, R. I. D. C. V., Carochinho, J. A. B., & Rendeiro, M. M. O. (2017). *The impact of positive psychological capital on psychological distress of primary and secondary education teachers*. *Psique*, 13, 40-56.
- Seligman, M. E., & Schulman, P. (1986). *Explanatory style as a predictor of productivity and quitting among life insurance sales agents*. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 50(4), 832-838.
- Singh, N., & Garg, A. (2014). *Psychological capital and well-being among teachers-A study on gender differences*. *Indian Journal of Applied Research*, 4(11), 426-428.
- Smithers, A., & Robinson, P. (2003). *Factors affecting teachers' decisions to leave the profession*. Centre for Education and Employment Research, University of Liverpool. Available on <http://dera.ioe.ac.uk/4759/1/RR430.pdf>
- Snyder, C. R. (2002). *Hope theory: Rainbows in the mind*. *Psychological Inquiry*, 13(4), 249-275.
- Stajkovic, A. D., & Luthans, F. (1998). *Self-efficacy and work-related performance: A meta-analysis*. *Psychological Bulletin*, 124(2), 240-261.
- Strauss, V. (2017). *Teachers in U.S. paid far less than similarly educated professionals, report finds*. *The Washington Post*, September 14, 2017.
- Wang, J. H., Chen, Y. T., & Hsu, M. H. (2014). *A case study on psychological capital and teaching effectiveness in elementary schools*. *International Journal of Engineering and Technology*, 6(4), 331.
- Williams, J., Ritter, J., & Bullock, S. M. (2012). *Understanding the complexity of becoming a teacher educator: Experience, belonging, and practice within a professional learning community*. *Studying Teacher Education*, 8(3), 245-260.
- Yalcin, S. (2016). *Analyzing the Relationship between Positive Psychological Capital and Organizational Commitment of the Teachers*. *International Education Studies*, 9(8), 75-83. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1110217.pdf>
- Youssef, C. M., & Luthans, F. (2007). *Positive organizational behavior in the workplace the impact of hope, optimism, and resilience*. *Journal of Management*, 33(5), 774-800.